REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-12 and 17-28 will be pending in the application.

Claims 13-16 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1-12 and 17-26 have been amended.

Claims 27-28 have been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to further define the claimed invention. Support for this amendment can be found at least in the application as filed, page 26, line 28, to page 27, line 3, and also page 46, lines 1-2.

Claim 1, along with claims 2-12, and 17-26, have also been amended for clarity.

No new matter has been introduced by the foregoing amendments.

Support for new claim 27 can be found at least in claim 1 as originally filed, as well as in the application as originally filed, page 11, lines 8-11, page 22, lines 20-22, page 26, line 28, to page 27, line 3, and page 46, lines 1-2.

Support for new claim 28 can be found at least in the application as originally filed, page 24, lines 1-7.

No new matter has been introduced by the foregoing new claims.

Amendments to, cancellation of, and additions to the claims, as set forth above, are made in order to streamline prosecution in this case by limiting examination and argument to certain claimed embodiments that presently are considered to be of immediate commercial significance. Amendment or cancellation of the claims is not in any manner intended to, and should not be construed to, waive Applicants' right in the future to seek such unamended or cancelled subject matter, or similar matter (whether in equivalent, broader, or narrower form) in the present application, and any continuation, divisional, continuation-in-part, RCE, or any other application claiming priority to or

through the present application, nor in any manner to indicate an intention, expressed or implied, to surrender any equivalent to the claims as pending after such amendments or cancellations.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

3. Rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,803,393 to Blum et al., hereafter "Blum", in view of European Patent No. 0,915,113 to Ohrbom et al., hereafter "Ohrbom".

Blum teaches a multicomponent system curable thermally and with actinic radiation, comprising A) an isocyanate-reactive binder comprising A1) at least one unsaturated polyester whose molecule contains on average at least one group that can be activated with actinic radiation, of the formulae I, II and/or III, and A2) at least one binder, different than (A1), whose molecule comprises on average at least two isocyanate-reactive functional groups, and/or A3) at least one binder, different than (A1), whose molecule comprises on average at least one isocyanate-reactive functional group and at least one reactive functional group having at least one bond that can be activated with actinic radiation, and B) a crosslinker comprising B1) at least one polyisocyanate and/or B2) at least one polyisocyanate whose molecule comprises on average at least one reactive functional group having at least one bond that can be activated with actinic radiation. (Blum, abstract). The radiation-active groups are attached to the parent structure of the binder (A3) by way of urethane, urea, allophanate, ester, ether and/or amide groups. (Blum, column 7, lines 9-11). Examples of suitable additional crosslinking agents are amino resins, carboxyl-containing compounds or resins, resins or compounds containing epoxide groups, blocked polyisocyanates, tris(alkoxycarbonylamino)triazines. (Blum, column 10, lines 39-62).

Ohrbom teaches a curable coating composition that includes a compound having both hydroxy functionality and carbamate functionality, a polyisocyanate crosslinking agent, and an aminoplast crosslinking agent. The effective equivalents of the aminoplast crosslinking agent is equal to or less than the equivalents of carbamate functionality and

the effective equivalents of polyisocyanate crosslinker is equal to or less than the equivalents of hydroxyl functionality. (Ohrbom, abstract).

Independent claim 1, as currently amended, is directed to a multicomponent system, comprising (I) at least one component comprising (A) at least one oligomer, polymer, or combination thereof, comprising on average at least two allophanate groups, carbamate groups or at least one carbamate group and at least one allophanate group, (B) at least one oligomer, polymer, or combination thereof, comprising on average at least two isocyanate-reactive functional groups, (C) at least one partly or fully alkylated amino resin comprising N-methylol ether groups or N-methylol and N-methylol ether groups, and (D) at least one compound comprising on average at least two groups which can be activated with actinic radiation, selected from the group consisting of pentaerythritol tetraacrylate, dipentaerythritol pentaacrylate, aliphatic urethane acrylates having six acrylate groups in the molecule, and a combination thereof; and (II) at least one component comprising (E) at least one polyisocyanate, with the proviso that the equivalents ratio of isocyanate groups in component (II) to isocyanate-reactive functional groups in component (I) is from 0.2:1 to 1:0.2, and the equivalents ratio of allophanate groups and carbamate groups in the oligomer and polymer (A) to the N-methylol and N-methylol ether groups in the amino resin (C) is from 0.2:1 to 1:0.2.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, or knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must provide some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was make. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as currently amended, is patentable over the combination of the prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) at least because the combination of Blum and Ohrbom, does not teach or suggest all the elements of

independent claim 1, as currently amended. Further, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the prior art with a reasonable expectation of success to arrive at independent claim 1, as currently amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that as currently amended, independent claim 1 recites a component (I) comprising at least four components (A)-(D), and a component (II), comprising at least one component (E). (D) is at least one compound comprising on average at least two groups which can be activated with actinic radiation, selected from the group consisting of pentaerythritol tetraacrylate, dipentaerythritol pentaacrylate, aliphatic urethane acrylates having six acrylate groups in the molecule, and a combination thereof. The combination of the prior art is silent regarding component (D), and there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the cited prior art to include a component (D) according to independent claim 1 as currently amended.

For example, Blum teaches that the binder component A1) comprising groups that can be activated with actinic radiation are polyester groups whose molecule contain 5 or 6 membered unsaturated rings of the formulae I, II, and/or III. (Blum, column 2, lines 25-55). Blum also teaches that radiation-active groups are attached to the parent structure of the binder (A3) by way of urethane, urea, allophanate, ester, ether and/or amide groups. (Blum, column 7, lines 9-11). Blum discloses (A3) to comprise on average at least one, in particular at least two, isocyanate-reactive functional group(s) and at least one, in particular at least two, reactive functional group(s) having at least one bond that can be activated with actinic radiation. (Blum, column 6, lines 10-15). That is, Blum teaches that the binder that comprises isocyanate-reactive groups (A2) is modified to also include actinic radiation active groups to arrive at (A3), and does not teach or suggest the use of a separate non-polymeric compound (D) that is selected from the group consisting of pentaerythritol tetraacrylate, dipentaerythritol pentaacrylate, and aliphatic urethane acrylates having six acrylate groups in the molecule.

Ohrbom, which is also silent regarding Applicants' (D), does not remedy this deficiency in Blum.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Blum and Ohrbom does not obviate independent claim 1 as currently amended, and consequently claims 2-12 and 17-26. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully assert that new claims 27 and 28 are also patentable over the combination of the prior art, at least in view of the above reasons with respect to (D). In addition, independent claim 27 recites: (A) at least one (meth)acrylate copolymer comprising on average at least two allophanate groups, carbamate groups or at least one carbamate group and at least one allophanate group, and (B) at least one (meth)acrylate copolymer, different from (A), comprising on average at least two isocyanate-reactive functional groups, in addition to (C), (D), and (E).

The combination of Blum and Ohrbom fails to teach all the elements of independent claim 27, and fails to provide suggestion or motivation to modify the prior art to arrive at independent claim 27 with a reasonable expectation of success.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 27 and 28 are also patentable over Blum and Ohrbom. Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application and pending claims are patentable in view of the foregoing remarks. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. As always, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Undersigned by telephone if direct conversation would be helpful.

Respectfully Submitted,

/MaryEGolota/

Mary E. Golota
Registration No. 36,814
Cantor Colburn LLP
(248) 524-2300

Friday, February 29, 2008

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS ONLY

BASF CORPORATION
1609 Biddle Avenue
Wyandotte, MI 48192
Customer No. 26922

MEG/IK